



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/736,150	12/15/2003	Osamu Nagai	13712	3663
7590 ORUM & ROTH 53 W. JACKSON BLVD CHICAGO, IL 60604		04/16/2009	EXAMINER BURCH, MELODY M	
			ART UNIT 3657	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 04/16/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/736,150

**Applicant(s)**

NAGAI, OSAMU

**Examiner**

Melody M. Burch

**Art Unit**

3657

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/9/09, 3/25/09.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1,3,5,7,9,11 and 13 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2,4,6,8,10,12 and 14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 December 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Drawings*

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the limitation of one shock absorber exclusively damping during compression and the other shock absorber exclusively damping during expansion as recited in claims 2 and 14 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

In addition to Replacement Sheets containing the corrected drawing figure(s), applicant is required to submit a marked-up copy of each Replacement Sheet including annotations indicating the changes made to the previous version. The marked-up copy must be clearly labeled as "Annotated Sheets" and must be presented in the amendment or remarks section that explains the change(s) to the drawings. See 37 CFR 1.121(d)(1). Failure to timely submit the proposed drawing and marked-up copy will result in the abandonment of the application.

***Specification***

2. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The originally filed specification fails to provide support for the phrase "except for unintended frictional effects, exclusively" in claims 2 and 14.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable

one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. In lines 3-4 of claim 2 and in lines 4-5 of claim 14 the phrase "except for unintended frictional effects, exclusively" does not enable one to make and/or use the invention in light of the drawings and portions of the originally filed specification. Although paragraph [0051] of the published application states "dampened by the compression side damping force generated by the compression side damping force generating means 101 of the hydraulic shock absorber 100 in the compression stroke, and by the expansion side damping force generated by the expansion side damping force generating means 201 of the hydraulic shock absorber 200 in the expansion stroke", the drawings as well as other paragraphs of the published application suggest that the shock absorbers do not have, except for unintended frictional effects, *exclusive* damping characteristics as claimed. For example, compression side damping force generating structure 101 shows both a check valve 43 for damping flow resulting from compression strokes as described in paragraph [0031] and a check valve 44 for damping flow resulting from expansion strokes as described in paragraph [0034]. Similar illustrations and descriptions exist for the expansion side damping force generating structure. In light of the illustrations and various sections of the specification supporting non-exclusive compression and expansion damping, the description does not enable one to make or use the exclusive damping aspect of the claimed invention. The remaining claims are rejected due to their dependency from claim 2.

5. Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The inclusion of the limitation of "the check valve when opened arranged to prevent damping" in lines 3-4 from the bottom of claim 2, for example, raises new matter. Because it is known in the art to have a check valve that provides damping, Examiner maintains that the language precluding the damping function of check valves needed to have been presented in the originally filed disclosure to avoid 112 rejections for new matter. Please note check valve 44 in US Patent 7354363 to Foster et al. and check valve 52 in US Patent 5787932 to Pierce, examples used to support the Examiner's position.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

6. Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, and 14 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed 1/9/09 and 3/25/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant continues to provide arguments regarding the exclusivity of compressive damping in one shock absorber and of expansive damping in

the other shock absorber. Applicant explained that Figure 2 represents the shock absorber that is arranged to provide damping exclusively during compression. Examiner maintained, however, that check valve 44 in figure 2 would provide some level of damping during expansion since the fluid passes by the valve 44 which is spring biased closed due to the presence of element 44b. Examiner further maintained that the other shock absorber of the invention did not provide exclusive damping during expansion since there was a level of damping during expansion present in the shock absorber illustrated in figure 2 as a result of elements 44 and 44b. Applicant responds that the "spring 44b...is not an active spring which biases the movement of the check valve during operation." Applicant further explains that the "check valve is free to and is intended to slide wide open immediately" and that "there is no disclosure of the check valve being capable of doing anything other than simply opening." Examiner disagrees. Applicant responds as if spring 44b serves no spring function although it is clearly shown as a spring and is clearly described in the specification as a spring. Spring 44b by its very nature would provide some level of biasing against the bottom surface of check valve 44. Fluid pressure on top of the check valve 44 would have to overcome the force exerted by spring 44b before the check valve 44 would open. Damping results from the pressure on the check valve 44 set by the spring 44b similar to the way in which damping occurs with check valve 76 due to the presence of spring 77 in US Patent 5850896 to Tanaka described in col. 6 line 67 – col. 7 line 12. Since the spring biased check valve 44 provides some level of damping (other than unintended damping from frictional effects) during expansion, the other shock absorber of the invention does

not provide exclusive damping during expansion as recited in the claims. If Applicant intended for one of the shock absorbers of the invention to provide exclusive damping during expansion, except for unintended damping from frictional effects, he would not have chosen to bias the check valve closed with a spring which is an intentional means by which damping is provided. A similar argument holds true for the limitation regarding the exclusivity of damping during compression in the shock absorber of figure 2. Accordingly, the 112 first rejections have been maintained.

***Conclusion***

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melody M. Burch whose telephone number is 571-272-7114. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (6:30 AM-3:00 PM).



If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Siconolfi can be reached on 571-272-7124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

mmb  
April 10, 2009

/Melody M. Burch/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3657